sprung originally from chaos, or the ocean; then it is plain, that notwithstanding all that rabble of gods mustered up by him, he fcould be no other than one of those Atheistic Theogonists before-mentioned, and really acknowledged no God at all, according to the true idea of him ; he being not a Theist, who admits of no self-existent Deity. But if the latter be true, that Hesiod supposed love to be a principle distinct from chaos, namely, the active principle of the universe, and derived all his other gods from thence, he was then a right paganic Theist, such as acknowledged indeed many gods, but only one of them unmade and self-existent, all the rest being generated or created by that one. Indeed, it appears from those passages of Aristotle, before cited *[116]* by us, that that philosopher had been sometimes divided in his judgment concerning Hesiod, where he should rank him, whether among the Atheists or theTheists. For in his book ***De*** *Ccelo* he ranks him amongst those, who made all things to be generated and corrupted, besides the bare substance of the matter, that is, amongst the absolute Atheists, and looked upon him as a ringleader of them; but in his Metaphysics, upon further thoughts, suspects, that many of those, who made love the chiefestof the gods, were Theists, they supposing it to be a first principle in the universe, or the active cause of things, and that not only Parme-nides, but also Hesiod, was such. Which latter opinion of his is by far the more probable, and therefore embraced by Plutarch,* who somewhere determines Hesiod to have asserted one<0sov dylvi^-rov, or unmade Deity; as also by the ancient scho-

[a] De Placitis Philosopher, lib, i. cap. vL